

ARIZONA PUBLIC SAFETY COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Summary of Minutes
November 28, 2007

Voting Members Present:

David Felix, Deputy Director, Arizona Department of Public Safety (Chairman)
Ray Allen, Assistant Chief, Tucson Fire Department (**via conference call**)
Marcus Aurelius, Emergency Management
Michael Brashier, Communications Manager, City of Casa Grande
Amy Brooks, Captain, Apache Junction Fire Department
Hal Collett, Sheriff, La Paz County/Arizona Sheriff's Association
Jan Hauk, Past President, Arizona Fire District Association Representative
Tracy Montgomery, Assistant Chief, Phoenix Police Department
Leesa Morrison, Director, Arizona Department of Homeland Security
Dora Schriro, Director, Arizona Department of Corrections (**via conference call**)
Danny Sharp, Chief, Oro Valley Police Department
Dan Wills, Battalion Chief, Sedona Fire District
Dewayne Woodie, Fire Chief, Ganado Fire District/EMS (**via conference call**)
Mike Worrell, Captain, Phoenix Fire Department (**via conference call**)

Voting Members Absent:

Kathleen Robinson, Assistant Chief, Tucson Police Department

PSCC Support Office Attendees:

Curt Knight, Executive Director, Public Safety Communications Commission
Jeff Miner, Project Manager, Public Safety Communications Commission
Wayne Kincheloe, Engineer II, Public Safety Communications Commission
Renee Larson, Administrative Services Officer, Public Safety Communications Commission
Evelyn Jablonski, Executive Assistant, Public Safety Communications Commission

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Chairman David Felix. Roll call was taken by Ms. Evelyn Jablonski as noted above and a quorum was declared present. Commissioner Dora Schriro indicated she had a prescheduled meeting and would only be able to participate in the meeting via conference call for 15 minutes. Commissioner Mike Worrell joined the meeting via conference call shortly after the roll was taken (approximately 2:05 pm).

Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Final Review and Public Safety Communications Commission Approval

Review and Discussion of Comments Submitted Regarding the Final Draft SCIP of November 24, 2007

Mr. Curt Knight indicated the most recent Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) available was the November 24, 2007 version which was posted on the PSCC website. He reported the nature of the comments received was relative to the formatting, spelling, grammar, acronyms, and structural composition of the SCIP of which most had been

incorporated and some were still being reviewed by Federal Engineering (FE). He felt those comments would not change the content or message of the SCIP but just add to the readability and understanding of it. He expressed his thanks to the commissioners and the public who contributed to the content of the SCIP via their input, suggestions, and recommendations.

Several comments were received pertaining to the removal of the appendices due to the length of the document becoming too overwhelming (460 pages). References to a web link or a direct contact with an office of responsibility for the information were preferred.

Mr. Knight reported it was questioned how to best express the statement of the Governor's goal to have 85% of the state's population interoperable within two years, as well as the Arizona Interagency Radio System (AIRS) deployment relative to the 85% coverage, and the overall measurement of that percentage. Another important area of discussion was the responsibility and timing for future actions as called out in the SCIP, either by this body, other agencies, or entities in support of those initiatives. Mr. John Murray, Senior Vice President, Federal Engineering, reported additional feedback was received and expressed in terms of the document style and content; however, changes or challenges to content were handled by contact with the responsible agency to verify the accuracy of the information.

Mr. Murray provided a detailed review of Strategic Initiatives 1-15 (Section 5.4 of the SCIP) which were not included in the November 11 version. As each Initiative was discussed, suggestions to modify, strike or add clarifying language were recommended by the PSCC Chairman and commissioners. Another important element added to this section was a three-level prioritization category of short, medium, or long term. Suggested changes are summarized below by Strategic Initiative number:

1 - Under the Action Plan subheading, a fifth bullet point was added; under Critical Milestones, a bullet point was added; no changes were made under Metrics. Commissioner Dan Wills questioned the expending of funding by July 30, 2008 being self-imposed or grant mandated? It was reported this funding expenditure needed to be recognized and was a milestone to be met or lost from a funding standpoint but nothing that was under our control.

2 – No changes were made to the Action Plan; one Critical Milestone added; three Metrics were added.

3 – Under Action Plan, first bullet added and second bullet wording revised.

4 – Under Action Plan, first bullet added. This bullet is a prerequisite for obtaining equipment and being able to turn on for service.

5 – This is a new initiative not included in the November 11 SCIP and will be used to support the strategic technology reserve investments.

6 – Under Action Plan, three bullets were added; under Critical Milestones, first and second bullets were revised, and third and fourth bullets were new; under Metrics, one bullet added. Question arose on bulleted item "Obtain ITAC and GITA approval for proposed PIJs." Does this apply only to state agencies? Suggested adding verbiage to read "as per state statute requirements." Another point was raised to also add this verbiage to MOU's between the state and various entities planning to join as partners in this.

7 – Under Action Plan, three new bullets were added; no changes to Critical Milestones or Metrics were made. Under Action Plan, it was suggested to strike “planned for extinction” on the third bullet point.

8 – The only change to this initiative was the new addition under Action Plan, “Issue Request for Proposals (RFPs).”

9 – Under this initiative, substantial changes were made to verbiage and dates. Under Action Plan, verbiage was added to first and second bullets, and 2 new bullets were added; under Critical Milestones, verbiage added to second bullet, and third bullet added; under Metrics, new bullet added. Under Action Plan, suggestion made to add language to second bullet “within one year of implementation” from seating of committee or implementation of the committee for further clarification. Recommendation was made to contact DEMA and confirm their agreement pertaining to their role. Mr. Knight indicated he would contact Director Lou Trammell.

10 – Under Action Plan and Critical Milestones, date added to first bullet for each. Questioned if the Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC) was prepared to meet these timeframes?

11 – This initiative is all new. Under Action Plan, “Determine lead agency or committee.” Will PSCC be the lead agency? It was felt the ownership of the plan would be with the PSCC.

12 – This entire initiative is new. It was questioned if PSCC was geared up to take on all these various activities with limited staff and meeting these specific deadlines. Mr. Knight felt with the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) grant there may be some availability of funds to augment additional staff for a couple of years.

13 – This is a new initiative as a result of feedback from Science Applications International Corporation.

14 – Under Action Plan, a new bullet added; under Metrics, two new bullets added. Recommended the removal of “probably on a tribe-by-tribe basis” from first bullet under Action Plan and replace with “as needed” language.

15 – This is a new initiative. Under Action Plan and Critical Milestones, recommended changes were to strike “political maneuvers” and replace with “required steps.” Remove apostrophe “s” from “other’s” from third bullet under Action Plan; and under Metrics, remove first bullet “A plan for addressing cross-border interoperability is accepted by the Arizona/Mexico Commission.”

Commissioner Dan Wills specifically called out three pages requiring changes to the language or removal from the SCIP:

Page 27 – first bullet – Modifying the first sentence to read, The use of plain language “and common terminology” rather than...

Page 57 – 2nd paragraph – eliminate the whole paragraph.

Page 163 – (Table 39) - Doesn’t reference “high capacity digital microwave overbuild for Yavapai County” from 2003-2008.

Ms. Lisa Meyerson, Government Information Technology Agency (GITA), advised that her team provided extensive comment to the SCIP which had not made its way into the SCIP. She recommended rather than trying to still include information at a very detailed level that we begin the development of tactical plans going forward, looking at the issue of staffing, consideration of the anticipated time frame of 1-2, 3-5, 5-8 (years to accomplish), figuring out the committees, etc. As an example, the Governance Committee tactical plan would detail frequency of

meetings, meeting dates, key elements to be accomplished, timelines for achieving those elements, and also addressing the issues of staffing and funding for each of those efforts.

Commissioner Leesa Morrison proposed the following three initiatives be put forth in the order below: 1) if no other changes being recommended to the SCIP, that the PSCC proceed with approval, 2) PSCC be directed, in conjunction with Arizona Department of Homeland Security and GITA, to develop an executive summary of the SCIP for approval by the Commission and be completed in 60 days, and 3) direct PSCC, in conjunction with Arizona Department of Homeland Security and GITA, to develop a tactical timeline, in conjunction with the executive summary, to be completed in 60 days. With the completion of the tactical timelines, a clearer vision for the creation of these various committees, the number of committees to be formed, their timelines and obligations would be known.

After some discussion pertaining to the 60 days being reasonable for PSCC staff and those involved, Commissioner Morrison felt we needed to stay firm on the 60-day (February 3, 2008) time frame using the submission date (December 3) of the SCIP as the beginning of the 60-day period. She expressed March 2008 was the expected timeframe when federal Department of Homeland Security (DHS) would be making the grant allocations and felt the executive summary could be submitted to DHS as a supplemental document to the SCIP.

Chairman Felix stated before we make a formal motion for approval of the SCIP he wanted to move ahead to agenda item #4, Call to the Public, to ensure the public had an opportunity to provide input or comment before the final approval of the SCIP. No comments arose from the public.

Discussion was held pertaining to Mr. Knight making contact with Department of Emergency and Military Affairs (DEMA) after the close of the meeting relative to several initiatives being proposed that would possibly require DEMA's input to those initiatives. It was recognized no changes would be allowed by DEMA at this time but we could advise them of future edits being incorporated in a future edition of the SCIP. Mr. Knight reported he would advise DEMA as best he could based on the circumstances.

PSCC Approval for Completion and Submission to U. S. Department of Homeland Security

Chairman Felix called for a motion for final approval and submission of the SCIP. The initial motion by Commissioner Danny Sharp including second and third amendments by Commissioner Sharp were for the approval of the SCIP based on the November 24 version with updates and changes that have occurred since, changes recommended and submitted by the Commission today, including non-substantive changes (grammatical, clerical, etc.) made by staff to improve the readability and understanding but not viewed by the Commission. After the first motion was made by Commissioner Sharp, it was learned from Mr. Murray that non-substantive enhancements have been ongoing since the November 24 version based on input from the Department of Public Safety, GITA, DHS, FE, and Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC). Ms. Meyerson also suggested including in the motion the grammatical, spelling, typographical, formatting, and cross-referencing changes. Hence, second and third amendments were made to cover suggested language of a non-substantive nature. All motions

were seconded by Commissioner Wills after initial, second, and third amendments. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion was then focused on initiatives (development of an executive summary and tactical timeline) put forth by Commissioner Morrison. However, Assistant Attorney General, Ms. Lisa Maxie-Mullins recommended, if possible, they be placed on a future meeting agenda and/or show how these initiatives relate to the approval of the SCIP. Commissioner Morrison stated she would be able to relate them to item number two on the agenda.

Commissioner Morrison motioned that PSCC be directed, in conjunction with Arizona Department of Homeland Security and GITA, to develop an executive summary of the SCIP to be completed in 60 days for approval by the Commission. Commissioner Wills seconded and motion passed unanimously.

Another motion was presented by Commissioner Morrison directing PSCC, in collaboration with Arizona Department of Homeland Security and GITA, to develop a tactical timeline to be completed in 60 days based on the Strategic Initiatives outlined in the SCIP and the committees formed by those initiatives. Commissioner Sharp seconded and motion passed unanimously.

Date, Time and Location of Next Meeting

December 11, 2007, 1:00 pm
City of Peoria Municipal Complex
(Council Chambers Building)
8401 West Monroe Street
Peoria, Arizona

Chairman Felix questioned if the option of teleconferencing would continue into the next meeting. Mr. Knight agreed it would.

Call to the Public

During discussion of agenda item 2(a), Chairman Felix moved to agenda item 4 to gain public comment relative to review and discussion of comments pertaining to the SCIP. No comments arose.

Adjournment

Chairman Felix called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Sharp moved to adjourn with a second motion made by Commissioner Wills. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.